



Sincerely yours,
Ted Kaczynski

THE UNABOMBER LETTERS

A YAHOO NEWS SPECIAL REPORT

"I have no idea what YouTube is."

In 2010, students at small Alabama college wrote to Kaczynski asking him about his views on the power of the Internet, which he was thrilled to discuss even though he's never used it.

All letters and documents are property of
the University of Michigan Library's Labadie Collection.

The selection was curated by Yahoo News

YAHOO!

NEWS

[Corrected first draft, SAVE. There is no carbon copy,]

THEODORE JOHN KACZYNSKI

04475-046

U.S. PENITENTIARY MAX

P.O. BOX 8500

FLORENCE CO 81226-8500

September 27, 2010

Dr. Maureen Kendrick Murphy

Professor of Chemistry

Huntingdon College

1500 East Fairview Avenue

Montgomery AL 36106-2148

Dear Dr. Murphy:

Thank you for your interesting letter of September 19, 2010, which I received today. Any one of your three questions could be the subject of a long essay, but I'll have to keep this letter relatively brief so that I can send it to you promptly. My mail tends to be slow anyway, because all my letters have to be reviewed by prison officers.

Before I address your questions specifically, I need to discuss two things.

First, the version of ISAIF ("Industrial Society and its Future") that you found on the Internet almost certainly contains numerous errors of which some are serious enough to obscure the meaning of an entire paragraph. Due to careless transcription, the version of ISAIF that appeared in The Washington

Post already contained numerous errors, some very serious. The Post's version was transcribed by other persons who added errors of their own, and their versions were transcribed in turn by yet other persons who added still more errors ... and so forth.

To my knowledge, only one version of ISAIF has been published in English without serious errors. You will find it in my book Technological Slavery, published by

FERAL HOUSE

1240 W. SIMS WAY #124

PORT TOWNSEND WA 98368

email: info@feralhouse.com

OR www.feralhouse.com

You can get Technological Slavery from Feral House for \$22.95 plus \$5.50 for shipping, total \$28.45, but you can order the book much more cheaply through amazon.com.

ISAIF takes up only about one fifth of Technological Slavery, and if you found ISAIF interesting I think you'll find the rest of the book equally so. ~~In any case it provides ample scope for critical thinking.~~

Second, your three queries all refer to "freedom", which leads us into the complicated question of what we mean by that word. "Freedom" as used in ISAIF

is defined in paragraph 94 and discussed in paragraphs 95-97, but this by no means solves all relevant problems. An adequate discussion of the concept of freedom would make this letter unreasonably long, so I'll just mention a few points.

(a) ISAIF's definition of freedom is not arbitrary; there is good reason to think that it expresses a biological need of human beings and of many other animals.

"R.W. White ... argued that the basic drive for control had been overlooked by learning theorists and psychoanalytic thinkers alike. The need to master could be more pervasive than sex, hunger, and thirst in the lives of animals and men. ... J.L. Kavanau ... has postulated that the drive to resist compulsion is more important to wild animals than sex, food, or water."

Here I'm quoting Martin E.P. Seligman, Helplessness: On Depression, Development, and Death, W.H. Freeman and Co., 1975, page 55. Much of Seligman's book is highly relevant to ISAIF's concept of freedom; see Technological Slavery, pages 273-76.

(b) In Technological Slavery I wrote (pages 277-78):

"The argument that 'people now have more freedom than ever' is based on the fact that we are allowed to do almost anything we please as long as it has no practical consequences. See ISAIF [paragraph] 72. ... [But] we live at the mercy of large organizations whose actions determine the

conditions of our existence, such as the state of the economy and the environment, whether there will be a war or a nuclear accident, what kind of education our children will receive and what media influences they will be exposed to. Etc., etc., etc.

"In short, we have more freedom than ever to have fun, but we can't intervene significantly in the life-and-death issues that hang over us. Such issues are kept firmly under the control of large organizations."

My contention is that the kind of freedom that is important for the satisfaction of human psychological needs is the capacity to deal on our own (as individuals or as ^{small groups}) with the issues of greatest practical importance, ^{the "life-and-death" issues,} and to do so without being subject to the control of large organizations. Freedom in recreational activities is fine as far as it goes, but it leaves important needs unsatisfied.

(c) The significance of a given freedom depends on the societal context in which it is found. One of the reasons for this is that the significance of a freedom depends in part on the way it affects the balance of power between the individual and any organizations or authorities to which he or she may be subject.

For example, today we have freedom of expression as guaranteed by the First Amendment, but this freedom has very little effect on the balance of power between the individual and large organizations.

Any new ideas expressed by a single individual are swamped by the vast volume of material put out by the media and on the Internet and therefore attract little attention. ^(See ISAIF, paragraph 96.) In fact, there is today a surfeit of ideas, including dissident and even outrageous ones, so that people either ignore new ideas or treat them as mere entertainment. Consequently, new ideas have no practical effect unless they are supported by a media campaign that would be beyond the resources of any but a very rich individual.

Several centuries ago, when there was no guaranteed freedom of expression, the balance of power was more favorable to the individual as against large organizations. In those days the educated sector of society was relatively tiny, printing presses were inefficient, and the expression of dissident ideas could be dangerous. Consequently new ideas were a scarce commodity, and when such ideas did appear people paid attention. Men like Jan Hus or Martin Luther, whose ideas gave expression to widespread discontents, could start a revolution merely by preaching. They did so at grave personal risk: Jan Hus was burned at the stake for his ideas. But nowadays the authorities wouldn't need to burn a man like Hus; they could just ignore him.

This brings me to your

Question 1. Does further global industrialization including the use of the Internet restrict our personal freedom to a greater degree than pre-Internet times?

I take it you are mainly interested in the question of whether the Internet has a liberating effect. At any rate, that is the question I will address.

The Internet increases the individual's freedom of expression in the sense that it greatly enhances his or her ability to send and receive ideas and information. In fact, the Internet now makes it easy for an individual to disseminate a message worldwide, whereas formerly he or she could have done so only at great expense.

But how does the Internet affect the balance of power between individuals and large organizations? I'm not going to offer a ^{definite} opinion on that subject, because I don't know enough about the Internet and its uses. However, I will point out some ways in which the Internet may weigh in favor of large organizations.

For one thing, there is the swamping effect that I mentioned a moment ago: With hundreds of millions of people putting their messages on the Internet, it would be extraordinarily difficult for any one individual to attract widespread attention to his or her message. Large organizations too make use of the Internet, they have resources vastly exceeding those of individuals, and they are in a position to apply sophisticated propaganda techniques. Consequently -- I conjecture -- the capacity of large organizations to influence people via the Internet

is incomparably greater than that of individuals.

The sheer volume of information and ideas that individuals receive via the Internet also has another effect:

There are good reasons to suspect that habitual use of the Internet shortens people's attention spans and impairs their ability to read and to think carefully. There was an article on this subject by Nicholas Carr, "Is Google Making Us Stupid?", in The Atlantic, July/August 2008. See also the important letter-to-the-editor by Gary Small, The Atlantic, October 2008, and Carr's recent book, The Shallows. Shortened attention spans and impaired capacity for careful reading and thinking probably do not interfere with, and may even enhance, the ability of large organizations to influence people by means of propaganda, but they do indeed interfere with an individual's ability to get his or her ideas across. I've received letters from people who probably would score quite respectably on IQ tests and who claim to have read ISAIF, but whose questions and comments show that they have failed to absorb some of the main ideas of ISAIF--most likely because they've had insufficient patience to read ISAIF with reasonable care. I can't prove it, but I do suspect that fifty years ago people would have read an essay like ISAIF more carefully.

There is also the problem of the unreliability of information received via the Internet. Certainly the problem of unreliability has existed for a long time with the print media. After my arrest in 1996, when I had an opportunity to compare what the media reported with

what I knew from my own experience, I was shocked by the amount of irresponsibility and even outright lying that I found in the media. But most likely some limitation is placed on the print media's irresponsibility by the fact that a printed book or article normally can be traced back to a specific author and publisher. The sheer number of different sources of the information found on the Internet, together with the fact that it often is difficult or impossible for an individual to trace a given piece of information to its source, probably means that Internet information is even less trustworthy than what one sees in print. Relevant to this subject is a book by Farhad Manjoo, True Enough: Learning to Live in a Post-Fact Society, John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Large organizations, on the other hand, have the resources to gather reliable information and don't need to put their trust in the Internet. Knowledge (reliable knowledge) is power, so it would seem that as individuals become more dependent on the (unreliable) Internet for their information, the balance of power shifts in favor of large organizations.

A further point: When you buy a newspaper, a magazine, or a book in a store and pay with cash rather than with a credit card, large organizations have no way of knowing about your purchase. But large organizations can and do keep track of the information that you access on the Internet, and in this way they can learn a great deal about your personal life. See "They're watching you". The Week. September

17, 2010, page 15. So in this respect too the Internet weighs in favor of large organizations in the balance of power.

Next I'll address your

Question 3. Can I think of an example in which personal freedom has been increased or augmented by any process of industrialization, excluding the medical field?

One obvious example is our freedom, or at least our power, to travel long distances (using modern means of transportation). But the value of this freedom or power has to be assessed in relation to the societal context. For example, a woman once wrote to me that she liked technology because it enabled her to visit her son--perhaps once a year--via jet airliner. But the dispersion of families across hundreds or thousands of miles became common only after the Industrial Revolution was well under way. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, families typically remained together in the same region. So if the woman I mentioned had lived in a traditional society she probably would have been able to see her son much more often than once a year, and she wouldn't have needed a jet airliner.

Another example is the freedom to choose one's occupation. In hunting-and-gathering societies little choice of occupation was available, since all individuals of the same age and sex did the same kind of work. In many peasant societies there may have been greater freedom to choose an occupation (see, e.g., Eliot M. Abrams,

How the Maya Built their World, University of Texas Press, 1994, page 111), but still much less than there is in the modern world, where the division of work into countless technical specialties provides a vast number of different occupations.

But there is a high price to be paid for specialization: A specialist's work is useless unless it is coordinated with the work of innumerable other specialists. (For example, an automotive engineer would be good for nothing without the factories that build automobiles, other factories that produce tires, batteries, and so forth, ~~the~~ the refineries that produce fuel, and the people who build and maintain roads.) Thus specialists unavoidably are dependent on, and therefore subordinate to, large organizations.

It might be difficult to trace the connection between industrialization and the freedom we have today to choose our own spouse, but such a connection probably does exist. In many traditional societies, probably the majority, marriages typically were arranged by the respective families of the bride and the groom. This does not necessarily mean that marriages were forced on unwilling partners. I would guess that forced marriages were ^{the exception, not the rule,} in the majority of pre-industrial societies. "Arranged" marriages could be love-matches that were arranged precisely because the partners wanted them. For example, the first marriage of the Apache leader Geronimo was a love-match, though he had to get the permission of his bride's

father and pay him a certain number of horses. Alexander B. Adams, Geronimo: A Biography, Da Capo Press, New York, 1971, page 75. On the other hand, there were some traditional societies in which marriages were very often forced, and forced by the most brutal methods. See Aldo Massola, The Aborigines of South-Eastern Australia: As They Were, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1971, pages 74-76.

In traditional societies, moreover, the pool of prospective spouses was limited, whereas today we have access, at least in theory, to millions of potential spouses whom we can meet via the Internet. However, it's not clear that this does us much good, for our divorce rate is extraordinarily high. Successful marriages were probably more common in traditional societies.

Now let me turn back to your

Question 2. Are there societies or communities who have consciously resisted industrialization in order to retain more personal freedom?

~~There certainly are societies or communities that have resisted industrialization, but they haven't necessarily done so for the sake of freedom. For example, Anabaptist sects such as the Amish have resisted industrialization for religious reasons.~~

I don't know of any societies or communities that have explicitly stated that they were resisting industrialization for the sake of freedom. I suspect that members of traditional societies tend not to think in terms of

abstractions like "freedom". Rather, they explain their resistance to industrialization in concrete and specific terms.

I have no doubt that at least some of the North American Indian tribes resisted the advance of civilization from motives that we would describe in terms of a desire to retain freedom. But the closest thing I can recall to an explicit statement of such a motive by an Indian is this:

"The agent outlined his Utopian dream to the principal chiefs [of the Utes] ... plans ... to raise their standard of living ... mills, orchards, wool plants, coal mines, and a railroad.... But Jack [a Ute Chief] had an irritating way of asking loaded questions He wanted to know if the high living standard of the whites was worth all the work and worry they had to put into it. He asked if the white men enjoyed working as much as the Utes enjoyed their lordly leisure of hunting and fishing and riding their ponies" This is from the American Heritage Book of Great Adventures of the Old West, page 318.

(I don't have the date of publication.)

I could say a great deal more in response to your second question, but this letter is already much longer than I intended it to be, so I'll close here.

I think a critical-thinking class like yours is a splendid idea, so if I can be of any further service to you, please let me know.

I would appreciate it if you would acknowledge this letter. My mail is not very reliable; letters that I send occasionally fail to reach the persons to whom they are addressed, so if a letter is not acknowledged I can't be sure that it has arrived at its destination. Thanks.

Sincerely yours,
Ted Kaczynski

LEW KALZINSKI

October 25, 2010

to
DR. MAURLEN KENDRICK MURPHY

[Corrected First draft, SAVE.
There is no carbon copy.]

Dear Dr. Murphy:

Thanks for your letter of October 13, which I received on October 20. I'll try to answer your questions

You ask whether I know of any other colleges or universities that use ISAIF as a text for a course or as a platform for critical thinking. I've occasionally received information (not necessarily reliable) to the effect that ISAIF was being used in a course at some college or university, but I have definite knowledge of only one institution that has used ISAIF in the recent past: Dr. David Skrbina teaches a course in the philosophy of technology at the Dearborn campus of the University of Michigan, and he has used ISAIF in his course. I assume he will use it again the next time he teaches the course. Dr. Skrbina, by the way, wrote an introduction for Technological Slavery.

At the end of your letter you mention an article in The Atlantic by Walter Isaacson, and you ask, "Who will decide what [information] is important and useful, and how would one assign a price to it?" I'm not sure whether this question is addressed to me or whether you only meant to indicate the question that Isaacson considered in his article. In any case I don't have much to say in response to this question, because I know very little about the enterprises involved in the dissemination of information. I'll only hazard a guess that the price of information will be determined by what are called "market forces".

Now the big question. You ask: "Do you think the power of an individual's personal comments and beliefs posted on the Internet can supersede that of large organizations so that an individual might one

day theoretically have more influence than do large organizations?"

Here again I'm handicapped by my lack of knowledge of the Internet. I have never had direct access to the Internet; I know only what I read in the print media and what people on the outside write to me, or what I can infer from Internet articles that they send me. So my answer to your question will be based mainly on general notions about the effects of the dissemination of ideas, rather than on any specific knowledge of the Internet.

You write: "We have noticed that seemingly insignificant individuals are able to garner huge audiences (on the Internet and/or You Tube^[*]) for expressing their views, singing, or entertaining others. These ideas often go 'viral' in a matter of minutes, but they are seldom intellectual ideas."

It sounds as if the phenomena you refer to are what sociologists call "fads" or "crazes". Fads and crazes are briefly discussed in the Encyclopaedia Britannica article "Collective Behavior" (15th ed., 2003, Vol. 16, pages 558-59), and are discussed at much greater length by Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior, Macmillan, New York, 1971. Fads and crazes are usually harmless and ephemeral phenomena that serve only to entertain the people who participate in them. Fads and crazes can occasionally have dangerous consequences (e.g., the antisemitic outburst mentioned in the Britannica article), but with its powers of propaganda and of physical coercion the technoindustrial system seems to be consistently able to prevent these occurrences from getting out of hand. Moreover, even if a fad or a craze did totally escape the system's restraints

*

I have no idea what You Tube is.

and have serious, lasting consequences, it would probably be something like a random phenomenon, not something its initiator could predict or control.

Financial crazes are a possible exception. I don't know enough about economics to venture an opinion as to whether major, long-lasting economic phenomena such as the Great Depression of the 1930s or the current recession could be described as results of financial crazes, but a financial craze can certainly cause many people to lose a great deal of money (e.g., the South Sea Bubble; see the Britannica article), and I can well imagine that a skilled financial manipulator might be able to use the Internet to start a craze in order to profit from it.

Apart from the foregoing, I find it hard to imagine that a single individual, or a small group of individuals, solely by posting ideas on the Internet, could exert a purposeful influence outweighing that of large organizations; and I mean an influence not merely on superficial phenomena such as fads and fashions, but influence on the decision of important questions that affect millions of people; for example, whether to continue offshore drilling for petroleum, how to reform the healthcare system, or what to do about illegal immigration.

I'll give my reasons for this opinion, and add some reservations, further on. But first I want to point out that even if a few rare individuals could exert a decisive influence via the Internet, that would not be very important in relation to the question we discussed earlier, namely, whether the Internet enhances personal freedom -- meaning personal freedom for people generally, not just for an occasional exceptional individual. Let's assume it's true that

in rare cases an individual, solely by posting his or her ideas on the Internet, can exert an influence on important issues that outweighs the influence of large organizations. Still that does nothing for the millions of other individuals who would wish to exert an influence on the same issues but cannot do so.

The nature of technoindustrial society is such that decisions have to be made that affect large numbers of people. If a decision affects a million individuals, then each individual can have, on average, only a one-millionth share in making the decision. See ISAIF, paragraph 117. Suppose for example that the question is whether, or how much, to raise property taxes in Cook County, Illinois in order to improve the school system. Since Chicago is located in Cook County the question affects several million individuals, and obviously only a minute fraction of that number can have a significant influence on the decision that will be made. Let's assume the question is to be decided by referendum. The only individuals who normally will have a significant influence over the decision will be a handful of people in positions of power, such as public officials, leaders of political parties, and officials of any corporations, labor unions, or other large organizations that may donate enough money to the political parties to be entitled to have their own views taken into account. Let's say that 5,000,000 voters will be affected by the decision and that there are just 50 individuals among them who will ordinarily have more influence over the decision than they get from possessing a single vote among 5,000,000. That leaves 4,999,950 people who individually have no perceptible influence over the decision.

Now let's assume that a single individual among those 4,999,950 could conceivably use the Internet to overcome the influence of the large organizations involved

and have the question decided according to his or her preference. That still leaves the other 4,999,949 individuals without any perceptible influence over the decision.

I have to break my letter off at this point because an urgent legal matter came up a short while ago, and I have to deal with it promptly. I'll continue the present discussion when I can, probably within the next week or so. Meanwhile, please give my regards to your critical-thinking class.

Sincerely yours,
Ted Kaepyski

to
DR. MAUREEN KENDRICK MURPHY

November 5, 2010

Dear Dr. Murphy:

I'll take up where I left off at the end of my letter of October 25. I was in the process of answering your question as to whether an individual, by posting ideas on the Internet, might be able to exercise an influence outweighing that of large organizations. I had just pointed out that even if an occasional individual could exercise vast influence via the Internet, it was still inevitable under modern conditions that almost all individuals would be subject to the effects of major decisions over which they could exercise no perceptible influence.

Contrast this with the situation existing in a small-scale society such as a hunting-and-gathering band of 25 individuals or a peasant village of 200, where -- in theory -- it was possible for any individual to have a significant influence on any decision that might be made. In practice, of course, even where the society was organized along egalitarian lines, it's safe to assume that in most cases some individuals had a great deal of influence while others had very little. Even so, a strongly motivated individual had at least a realistic fighting chance to make his or her influence felt when he or she had 24 or 199 other individuals to compete with, whereas a modern individual struggling to make his or her influence felt has millions of others to compete with and therefore has only a negligible chance of success unless he or she is extraordinarily talented.

Since formal authority tended to be monopolized by males in traditional societies, it's worth noting that informal power could often outweigh explicitly-recognized authority. Thus Poncins wrote in reference to the Eskimo women of northern Canada: "[T]hey are not only the mistresses of their households but also, in most Eskimo families, the shrewd prompters of their husbands' decisions." See Technological

Slavery, page 139. Peter Freuchen made a similar statement about the Greenland Eskimos he knew: "[T]he husband ... is ruler and dictator of the household. ... This may give the impression that the poor women are underdogs. Quite the opposite is true ...; the man is the mouthpiece, the woman the brains -- unofficially, of course." Peter Freuchen, Arctic Adventure: My Life in the Frozen North, The Lyons Press, Guilford Connecticut, 2002, page 44. (This book was first published many decades ago and refers to the early part of the 20th century.)

I don't mean to say that women had as much or more power than men in all small-scale societies. I don't believe that was true. My point is simply that explicitly recognized authority is far from a reliable index of real power.

*

*

*

Now let me return to my letter of 10/25/10, where I wrote:

"I find it hard to imagine that a single individual, or a small group of individuals, solely by posting ideas on the Internet, could exert a purposeful influence outweighing that of large organizations; and I mean an influence not merely on superficial phenomena such as fads and fashions, but influence on the decision of important questions that affect millions of people ..."

I then promised: "I'll give my reasons for this opinion, and add some reservations, further on."

Now it's time to keep my promise.

In my letter to you of 9/27/10 I pointed out one big reason why individuals can't exert much influence solely by propagating ideas, via the Internet or otherwise: Nowadays there is such a surfeit of ideas that new ideas tend to be either ignored or treated as mere entertainment. The latter apparently is what happens with the ideas that "go 'viral' in a matter of

minutes" as you related in your letter of 10/13/10: I take it these are ideas that are used only as entertainment.

One reservation I need to add here is that an individual could exert an important influence by coming up with an idea that many people could usefully apply in their own lives. An example would be the fellow who invented Facebook. (I think his name is something like Zuckerberg--you would know.) Facebook is a facility that many people can use for their own purposes, and its invention may have a significant effect on society. But no one, including Zuckerberg, can predict what the eventual effect of Facebook will be. So it can't be said that Zuckerberg has exerted a purposeful influence: He can neither predict nor control, and probably doesn't care, how his invention will affect society.

We may doubt, moreover, whether Zuckerberg's action makes any difference in the long run. Since Facebook obviously fills a widely felt need, it seems very likely that if Zuckerberg hadn't invented it when he did, someone else would have come up with something similar a few years later.

If society faces an important question, it can be assumed that many individuals, and also organizations large and small, will be interested in the question and will be addressing it on the Internet and elsewhere. One can always speculate that some extraordinary individual genius might advocate his ideas so brilliantly that he could prevail over all of the other individuals and organizations involved, but if such cases ever occur they must be exceedingly rare.¹ This is a very different situation from one in which an

1. Again a reservation: An individual discovering information not publicly known might achieve significant results by revealing that information on the Internet. One can imagine, for instance, an oil-company employee publicizing safety violations committed in offshore drilling.

individual comes up with a cute idea that gives rise to a short-lived fad. Usually no one bothers to oppose a fad, because the whole thing is just for fun.

But when an individual tries to promote his ideas on a question of public importance he can expect to meet determined opposition--unless most people already agree with him anyway, in which case the individual's own efforts are superfluous.

It should be remembered that when an individual appears to be influential, he or she may really be only a mouthpiece for, or a tool of, one or more large organizations. Thus, Sarah Palin may seem to be influential, but I strongly suspect she is handled by professional political operatives, "GOP consultants" (see The Week, Oct. 8, 2010, page 16) who use her for their own purposes.

I don't mean to suggest that individuals and small groups can never make an important difference in large-scale societies. I simply mean that, with the exceptions noted, they can't make a difference solely by publicizing ideas, whether on the Internet or elsewhere. In order to accomplish anything they have to organize for practical action, recruit a following, and devote an enormous amount of time and effort to the work.² Of course, their work may be greatly facilitated through use

2. Yet another reservation: The individuals who organize for practical action need not be the same as those who originate the ideas that the action is intended to implement. But when an individual merely propagates ideas and leaves it to others to organize for practical action, he runs a grave risk that the organizers will distort or reinterpret his ideas so that the outcome is very different from what he expected. Jesus and Marx, for example, would surely have been appalled at some of the uses to which their ideas were put.

of the Internet. I'm not able to give an opinion as to whether the utility of the Internet in this respect outweighs the problems created by the Internet that I mentioned in my letter of 9/27/10 (answer to Question 1).

The foregoing discussion is tangent to the subject of an essay that I recently wrote on the ways in which an initially small group might hope to change a large-scale society. I thought of sending you a copy of the essay but decided against it, because I believe your class already has more than enough problems in critical thinking to keep it very busy. DELETE

*

*

*

I notice that for Week 2, Fri., Sept. 3, your tentative calendar for PACT 103 lists Alston Chase's "Harvard and the making of the Unabomber". I'm not sure whether this refers to the Atlantic article or to the subsequent book that was based on the article. I haven't read the book, but I did read the article.

Chase's article is misleading and even contains a couple of outright lies. The main point of interest to you is that Chase is dead wrong in concluding that I acquired my "political" outlook (opposition to modern technology, etc.) at Harvard. The development of my political outlook was already well under way before I went to Harvard, and while I was at that university I never heard anyone, whether students or faculty, express any sort of antitechnological views. Moreover, Chase greatly exaggerates the impact of the psychological experiments of Henry A. Murray. In the course of Murray's studies I was never given drugs of any kind, nor was I given any food or drink through which a drug could have been surreptitiously administered.

During our correspondence Chase promised to let me fact-check his article before it was published,

but he did not keep that promise. Nor was I ever contacted by the Atlantic's fact-checkers.

Chase was motivated by his resentment of Harvard resulting from the fact that when he was a student there he did not receive the attention and respect to which he felt he was entitled. It even appears that Chase suffers from delusions of persecution. He stated explicitly that he was being persecuted by the media.

These are strong charges, but they are backed up by my correspondence with Chase. If you've studied what Chase has written about me, you really should study that correspondence too.

My correspondence with Alston Chase is on file in the Special Collections Library at the University of Michigan. You can get a copy of it, though there will be a fee to cover the cost of copying and mailing. The library also imposes a hundred-page limit, and it's possible that my correspondence with Chase somewhat exceeds a hundred pages, in which case you won't be able to get all of it without travelling to Ann Arbor. The person to contact is:

JULIE HERRADA

CURATOR - LABADIE COLLECTION

711 HATCHER LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR MI 48109-1190

phone: 734-764-9377

*

*

*

Having seen the syllabus and calendar for your course, I have to say that I don't envy you your job. Teaching such a course must be exceedingly strenuous and difficult.

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaegyński

to
DR. MAUREEN KENDRICK MURPHY

November 9, 2010
[Corrected first draft,
SAVE. There is no
carbon copy.]

Dear Dr. Murphy:

I trust you've received my letters of October 25 and November 5.

Yesterday evening I reread an article by Michael Hirschorn, "Truth Lies Here", The Atlantic, November 2010, pages 58-64, and it reminded me of certain things that throw doubt on some of the opinions I expressed in my letters of October 25 and November 5. I had actually read the article, hastily, long before I wrote my letter of November 5, maybe even before I wrote that of October 25, but I hadn't digested the article properly. I've also been aware for some time of the existence of Andrew Breitbart and Julian Assange, but I hadn't made the connection between them and your question about the influence that an individual might exert via the Internet. (If you infer from this that I don't do much thinking about the Internet, you're quite right.)

Anyway, by reminding me of people like Breitbart and Assange, Hirschorn's article made me wonder whether I had gone too far in discounting the possibility of individual influence via the Internet. But I know so little about Breitbart and Assange that it's difficult for me to judge what bearing they might have on the argument about individual influence. Here are some of the questions that arise:

(a) Regarding both Breitbart and Assange: To what extent do they operate as individuals and to what extent as heads of organized groups that work with them by digging up information, etc.? (Compare what I wrote in my letter of

11/5/10: "In order to accomplish anything [individuals and small groups] have to organize for practical action, recruit a following")

(b) Regarding Assange: In my letter of 11/5/10, footnote 1, I pointed out: "An individual discovering information not publicly known might achieve significant results by revealing that information on the Internet. One can imagine, for instance, an oil-company employee publicizing safety violations committed in offshore drilling." Assange doesn't well fit this pattern, because he repeatedly and systematically seeks out and publicizes information that has been concealed. The timely revelation of safety violations in offshore drilling might have prevented the recent oil-spill in the Gulf of Mexico, but more often the revelation of private information merely gives rise to a public scandal that soon blows over and doesn't really change anything. Maybe some politician's career is ruined, but he's soon replaced by another politician. So one has to ask, how much influence does Assange really have? That's a question I can't even begin to answer.

(c) Regarding Breitbart:

(i) Is he really acting as an individual or as the leader of a small group, or is he essentially a mouthpiece for the politicians who head the movement that we might call "the sociopathic right"?

(ii) Even if Breitbart is acting strictly on his own individual initiative, he certainly didn't start the movement for which he speaks. He simply tells the movement what it wants to hear. It is a truism that people want their leaders to tell them what they already believe and

lead them in the direction they already want to go. So does Breitbart really make any difference? If he hadn't existed, wouldn't someone else have arisen out of the movement who would have performed much the same function as Breitbart?

Even if people like Assange and Breitbart can correctly be regarded as individuals who exert great influence via the Internet, the most important point that I made in my letter of 10/25/10 still stands: Assuming that a few individuals can use the Internet to make themselves more influential than large organizations, it remains true that the vast majority of individuals lack any perceptible influence over the major public decisions that affect their lives.

Sincerely yours,
Ted Kaczynski

LEU KALAYNANI
to
DR. MAUREEN KENDRICK MURPHY

December 18, 2010
[Corrected first draft.
SAVE. There is no carbon
copy.]

Dear Dr. Murphy:

Thank you for your interesting letter of 12/9/10, which I received yesterday, and thank you for trying to send me a copy of Charles Hudson's book The Southeastern Indians and a copy of the Journal of Undergraduate Chemistry Research. But, as you probably know by now, I was not allowed to receive either of these volumes.

According to BOP (Bureau of Prisons) rules, federal prisoners are allowed to receive books and periodicals only if they are sent directly from the publisher, a book club, or a bookstore. (Amazon.com is apparently treated as a bookstore for this purpose.) The rationale behind this is that a private individual sending a book or a magazine to a prisoner could use it to conceal drugs or other things that are not supposed to get into prisons. This is reasonable in the case of hardcover books, but it's not so clear whether the rule is reasonable in the case of magazines and paper-backed books. However, the courts have upheld the constitutionality of these restrictions.

The BOP tried to stretch the rule even farther and prevent prisoners from receiving even a single newspaper clipping, a single page photocopied from a book, or a page from the Internet. For this there could be no plausible rationale based on the need to prevent contraband from being smuggled into prisons. An

inmate here at the ADX took the BOP to court on this issue, and won. That's why I was allowed to receive the two articles from Science that you sent me (about arsenic-using bacteria and "prebiotic soup"). How many pages of photocopied material a prisoner will be allowed to receive at one time remains (as far as I know) an open question, but I feel reasonably safe in assuming that a stack of unbound photocopied pages not more than a quarter inch thick will normally be allowed to reach me. That's for the present. What the future may hold is another matter. The general trend within the BOP is toward ever-tighter restrictions, and it's not clear how much protection will be available from the courts in the future, for both the major parties have demonstrated their inclination to appoint Supreme Court justices having insufficient respect for the Bill of Rights.

Anyway, the two volumes you sent me should have been returned to you by now, with a rejection notice. My copy of the rejection notice does not list any postage stamps, but the stamps you sent me should have been returned to you too. Prisoners here are allowed to receive stamps only by purchasing them from the prison commissary; accordingly, I did not receive the stamps you sent, and they should have been listed on the rejection notice.

At the moment I have plenty of money in my prison account, and the few stamps I've expended on correspondence with you have not been a problem for me. But I do appreciate your thoughtfulness in

attempting to send me stamps.

To return to the subject of books: It's not a good idea to order books for me (even if they are sent directly from the publisher) without consulting me first. Inmates here are not supposed to possess more than eight books at one time. It's true that this rule is not strictly enforced, but even so I have to be careful not to accumulate too many books. Twice in the past I've been told to send out some of my books because I had too many. I usually have as many books on hand as I dare to keep, and the turnover is slow. Most of my time is taken up with writing projects and correspondence, and in order to be able to make use of the information I find in books I have to take notes; on some books I take fifty or more pages of notes, so as you can imagine it often takes me a long time to get through a book.

*

*

*

You ask what I think about the research on bacteria that utilize arsenic in place of phosphorus. From a technical point of view I can't comment; I never took a course in chemistry beyond high school. But you're obviously right when you remark that "the arsenic eventually has to go somewhere". Organic toxins can be destroyed -- by burning them, if nothing else -- but there's no

practical way of destroying toxic elements like arsenic, mercury, lead, and you can doubtless name others. These elements have been stored for eons underground in the form of ores. I assume that erosion of the ore deposits has caused toxic elements to be gradually diffused throughout the environment, but since the process has been very slow, living organisms have had millions of years to adapt to any increases in environmental levels of these toxins. Now humans are digging into the ores and releasing toxic elements into the environment at a rapid rate. It might be possible in principle to collect some of these elements -- e.g., through the use of arsenic-eating bacteria -- and find a way to store them underground again as securely as they were once stored in the form of ores. But can the associated technical problems be solved, and solved for all of the toxic elements now being released? And will it be economically feasible to put the solutions into practice? Compare the case of nuclear waste: The first nuclear reactors were built nearly 70 years ago, and, as pointed out in Technological Slavery, pages 417-18, no secure way of disposing of reactor waste has yet been developed.

*

*

*

It's impressive that your class found your PACT course so interesting that they asked to continue meeting next semester. That's quite a tribute to your performance as a teacher.

At the end of your letter you remark: "We hope to continue our discussions with you..." I'll be

delighted to continue our discussions. I've received many letters about ISAIF, but most have been from people who have merely reacted emotionally, or have read ISAIF so carelessly that they have missed essential points. Those correspondents who have read carefully, and who have offered worthwhile comments and questions or challenged my arguments intelligently, are a small, precious minority. Clearly you have inspired your students to probe deeply into the issues raised in ISAIF, so your entire class has joined that small, precious minority.

So, again, it will be my pleasure to continue our discussions. Just one reservation: In order to make any progress with my own writing projects, I often have to make time for them by putting my correspondence on hold for a while. So I hope you'll forgive me if I'm sometimes slow to answer your letters.

Best regards,
Ted Kaczynski

PACT 103
Practicing the Art of Critical Thinking
"Analysis of the Impact of the Media on Society"

Instructor: Dr. Maureen Kendrick Murphy
Class Meeting: 10:30-11:30 a.m. MWF, Bellingrath 202
Office: Bellingrath 105-A
Office Hours: Wednesdays & Thursdays, 1:00-4:00 p.m.
 Other times by appointment.
Phone: 334.833.4462 (o) 334.361.9446 (h)
Email: maureenm@huntingdon.edu, murphdog53@gmail.com
Websites: <http://pact.huntingdon.edu> and <http://www.chemgal.yolasite.com>

Required Texts:

- *Asking the Right Questions: A Guide to Critical Thinking*, Neil Browne & Stuart M. Keeley. ISBN 13: 978-0-205-50668-2
- *Perspectives on Contemporary Issues: Readings Across the Disciplines*, Katherine Ackley. ISBN 13: 978-1-4130-3397-7

Course Description:

PACT 103 will develop your skills as a critical thinker and communicator. These skills are the foundation of Huntingdon's liberal arts education and will support your academic success throughout your college years and beyond.

Critical thinking is a powerful way of looking at the world; it is the process of observing subjects from a fair-minded point of view, asking thoughtful, informed questions, and developing answers that are well-reasoned, well-supported, and clearly communicated.

In this class, you will engage with controversial issues and unfamiliar ideas, work to understand different points of view, and develop your own thoughtful and well-reasoned positions. This will not only help you develop intellectual skills that will serve you well through your college experience, but also provide you with important tools for success beyond college. Strong critical thinking and communication skills will enable you to make accurate and powerful decisions as a reasonable, free-thinking individual.

Much too optimistic